

**Remarks/Arguments:**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed April 8, 2009. Claims 1-66 and 68 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-66 and 68. The present Response amends claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 13, 35, 36; add new claims 69-74; and cancel claims 18-32, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-17; 33-66; and 69-74. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

**I. Double Patenting**

In the Office Action, Claims 18-23, 25, 28-32 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1-6, 8, 12, 13, 15-17 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/7876742. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 18-23, 25, 28-32 have been canceled. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

**II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 15-16, 18-21, 23-27, 29-31, 33-36, 38-43, 45, 47-48, 50-53, 55-60, 62, 64-65, and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry et al (US Pub. No. 2003/0167315) in view of Cohen et al (US Patent No. 7310677).

Claims 5, 12, 14, 22, 28, 37, 44, 46, 54, 61, and 63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry et al (US Pub. No. 2003/0167315) in view of Cohen et al (US Patent No. 7310677) in view of Alcorn et al (US Patent No. 6988138).

Claims 17, 32, 49, and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry et al (US Pub. No. 2003/0167315) in view of Cohen et al (US Patent No. 7310677), further in view of Flesner et al (US Pub. No. 2002/0194267).

**Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of “*wherein the at least one portlet is associated with a selected content selector from the plurality of content selectors, and wherein each different content selector of the plurality of content selectors can cause different content to be displayed on the at least one portlet based on dynamic evaluation of personalization rules.*”

Chowdhry discloses a portlet or “WERCLET” repository server to store all necessary identifying characteristics of each portlet (Paragraph [0110]).

Cohen discloses a resolver service that defines the behavior of a portal and how it interacts with the user (Column 7, Lines 14-15).

Applicant respectfully submits that Chowdhry and the other prior art do not teach or make obvious that a portlet can be associated with a selected content selector from the plurality of content selectors and each content selector of the plurality of content selectors can cause different content to be displayed on the at least one portlet based on dynamic evaluation of personalization rules.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claims 33 and 50**

Claims 18, 33 and 50, while independently patentable, recite limitations that are similar to Claim 1, and that are not disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claims 2-17, 34-49, and 51-66**

Claims 2-17, 34-49, and 51-66 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

### **Claim 69**

Claim 69 depends on Claim 1. Furthermore, Claim 69 includes the feature of “wherein the personalization rules for each of the plurality of content selectors contains natural language phrases that are editable using a context-sensitive editor, wherein the context-sensitive editor

allows a user to change any pre-selected highlighted phrase in the personalization rules for each content selector.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Chowdhry and the other prior art do not teach or make obvious that the context-sensitive editor can edit rule definition of a selected content selector using highlighted natural language phrases.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 69, as added, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claim 70**

Claim 70 includes the feature of “*wherein the personalization of the portal is adapted to deliver personalized content to a user based on one or more criteria using at least one placeholder, wherein the at least one placeholder is associated with a placeholder definition in natural language phrases.*”

Applicant respectfully submits that Chowdhry and the other prior art do not teach or make obvious that a portal can deliver personalized content to users based on one or more criteria using at least one placeholder that is associated with a placeholder definition in natural language phrases.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 70, as added, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claims 71-73**

Claims 71-71 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from allowable independent claim 70, and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

### **III. Conclusion**

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting the issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 8, 2009

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/  
Kuiran (Ted) Liu  
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800